DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 458 SP 032 689

AUTHOR Conle, Carola
TITLE Folk Models and Change in a Teacher's Practical Knowledge.
SPONS AGENCY Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Environment; Collegiality; Discourse Analysis; Folk Culture; Foreign Countries; Grade 8; Junior High Schools; *Models; Participant Observation; *Personal Narratives; Story Grammar; *Teacher Student Relationship; *Teaching Styles
IDENTIFIERS *Knowledge Base for Teaching

ABSTRACT

Folk models have been called unspecified programs that are passed on and learned experientially. Through a narrative reconstruction of a participant observer's fieldnotes on an eighth-grade teacher's professional activity, the researcher sensed two folk models at work: (1) knowledge as corpus, hierarchically organized; and (2) knowledge in relation to people that is communicatively structured. By looking at the second model through narrative, the researcher attempts to demonstrate that professional knowledge, like cultural knowledge, is shared and passed on through enactments, particularly through the experience of narrative detail: feelings, moods, imaginative acts, physical arrangements, personal aims and fears, in sum, bits of enacted story. The narrative is seen as a folk model in action whose plot centers on building relationships. According to the narrative, the teacher made specific moves to bring about a sense of community among her students and between the students and herself. The narrative also points up a specific goal--to create a democratic community, describes the setting and emotional atmosphere, and has a moral. Top-down implementation of such a cultural model is impossible, but telling and retelling the story will shape teachers' continued living of it and will call for reconstructions. (Excerpts from the narrative under discussion constitute six pages of text in this document. Thirty-four references are listed. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325458

Folk Models and Change in a Teacher's Practical Knowledge

by

Carola Conle

Paper prepared for a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 1990.

This work was funded by SSHRC grant #411-83-0001-X2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Copyright© 1990

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Carola Conle
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

SP032 689

aera90_abst_90apr2.mss
[cconle,aera]
[isaac.barrat_stor_sim.carols]
June 15, 1990

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the inquiry is to explore the personal-social interface of professional knowledge. The notions of *knowledge as hierarchical body* and *knowledge as relating to people* are common assumptions underlying academic writing, certain everyday expressions, as well as curriculum guidelines. These notions are described here as two cultural or folk models which shape the professional practice of a grade eight teacher. I take the non-propositional nature of folk models as my point of departure and describe the narrative quality of the second model as enacted by the teacher and recorded by a participant observer. Theme, plot, setting, mood and moral directives in the narrative, all demonstrate the potential for change through individual variations of the enactment, while they simultaneously maintain a professional prototype.

Since the contents of the folk model were in part shared among teacher, students and researcher through enacted and perceived narrative, there are implications for professional development. Top down implementation of these cultural models is impossible because of their inexplicit and open-ended quality. However, aspects of the model were nevertheless learned by students in this particular teacher's classroom. The research activity itself also contributed to the sharing of the model, besides providing insights into the understandings of a professional group from the perspective of individuals, via individual enactments and collaborative telling and retelling of the narrative.

submit_folk_90may26.mss
[connle.secs]
[ieejn.bayrst_stor_sss.carols]
June, 1990

Folk Models and Change in a Teacher's Practical Knowledge

In journals and discussions with student teachers this year I have been confronted repeatedly by questions such as "How do beginners relate to and profit by the knowledge of the profession they do not yet consider theirs"? Student teachers tell me they profit most through watching, doing and reflecting, but tensions come up when they compare their own or associate teachers' practice to models and advice given in the literature. They believe associates fall short of the mark; that they themselves fall short of the mark. For me this links to the general question of how professional knowledge is passed on. To get hold of this problem in a different way I decided to look at professional knowledge as knowledge which is predominantly of a cultural rather than a technical nature. I therefore look at the passing on of such knowledge not as a technical process, but as a cultural one, akin to the way any of us are inducted from early childhood into the values and behaviours of our own culture.

Cultural knowledge is essentially inexplicit, tacitly held and socially shared. Anthropologists have used the term folk model to label tacit stocks of cultural knowledge, e.g., D'Andrade (1981) calls folk models unspecified programs that are passed on and learned experientially, as problems are solved within a network of human relationships. I set myself the task to look at teaching as a cultural activity, perhaps describable through folk models. The[1] motivation for this work also arose out of a concern I share with Michael Connelly (1987, 1989, with Clandinin 1988), Freema Elbaz (1981), and Jean Clandinin (1985), a concern to view teachers' professional knowledge as both personal and social, and in this linkage not to relegate the personal to being a mere illustration or instantiation of social structures, nor, on the other hand, to create generalizations out of an in-depth understanding of one particular case.

---

[1]I would like to thank Dolores Furlong, Rosalie Young, Michael Connelly, Carol Mullen, Jill Bell, Hal Grunau and Jessie Lees for their help in the preparation of this paper.

Given these concerns it is generally important to stress the influence of each member of a professional group on the content of the model, and to point to the links and implications for individual teacher's development and particular student's learning.[2] My effort in this paper is to move toward partial knowledge of a professional group through understanding particular actions of a particular grade 8 teacher, Carol Burke.[3] In my work with her I view the group knowledge of teachers through cultural or folk models.

I was initially attracted to work with Carol Burke by the emphasis on relationships and a sense of community I sensed in the description of her teaching.[4] She seemed to be the kind of teacher I would have liked to be during the time I taught high school, a time which I see now as having been contoured predominantly by a view of knowledge as a body or corpus, the content of which is hierarchically organized. In 1990, as I read fieldnotes written about her classroom in 1986/87, I wanted to find out more about her teaching by thinking her narrative through with her. I also began to conceptualize two folk models through my reading of her instructional moves, the student/teacher interactions and the reflective comments Carol Burke made to Cathy Allen, her participant researcher. I began to construct narrative accounts of her teaching activities and her "personal practical knowledge" (Connelly & Clandinin, 1984, 1988a) and then brought these to her for her perusal and comments. I discussed what I wrote with her and observed her in a different setting in a new school this year. Burke enjoyed reminiscing and reflecting about her 86/87 situations and linking these to her current teaching. I enjoyed watching her teach and talking things over with her. By doing this I reconstructed some of my own narrative of teaching and learning. Our telling and retelling had spinoffs in the reliving; I am a different teacher, I believe, for having heard her story, and she is more aware of the tensions inherent in her work.

---

[2]Zeichner (1989) points to a conundrum in teacher development, when he asks "whether the profession as a whole can ever develop a sense of shared professional standards; yet shared professional standards are one of the defining features of a profession" (p. 1).

[3]Pseudonym used for the sake of privacy.

[4]These descriptions of Carol Burke's teaching were in the fieldnotes Cathy Allen made in 1986/87 as a researcher/participant for the Second International Science Study Canada (Connelly, Crocker & Kass, in press).

While looking at fieldnotes on her 86/87 grade eight classroom, I began to think of folk models as having a narrative or what I called an "is when" quality: I thought that if I asked teachers to tell me about what communication, relationships and a sense of community have to do with curriculum, they might give me a philosophical statement, but more likely they would give me something that has a temporal stretch to it, which I call an "is when" quality. Children, when asked the question "what is (for example communication)?", often answer, "it is when I do such and such". One child may argue "no, it is when I do so and so". In this way parts of a folk model get negotiated and passed on. I believe that in a professional context many "is when" stories are told that are experiences and expressions of folk models at work.[5]

For this reason I gathered aspects of two folk models in Burke's professional situation through a narrative retelling of events in her classroom and I sensed two folk models at work,[6] one: *Knowledge as body or corpus, hierarchically organized* and two: *knowledge in relation to people that is communicatively structured.* By looking at what I call the narrative qualities of one of these folk models in this paper, I believe I open up a space to see the personal practical knowledge of an individual teacher at work within the model, and thereby I also open a perspective to view the possibility of continual change in the cultural models via individual enactments of them. The influence of the individual or personal on what is socially shared then counters notions of determinism or disempowerment on account of predominant social structures. This will be further elaborated throughout the paper.

Folk models draw their power from being inexplicit, non-propositional, lived and socially shared (D'Andrade 1981). They are not the kind of knowledge that fits into a technical rational frame[7] of professional practice, or, more generally speaking, into an objectivist

---

[5]Carr (1986) proposes that our experience of actions and of our selves has a narrative quality.

[6]In this paper I use a *folk model* and *cultural model* alternately since I do not want to stress an expert/folk dichotomy one might attribute to the use of the term *folk*.

[7]I am using the term *technical rational* as Schön (1983) spoke of it.

view of reality. Johnson (1987) discusses the objectivist point of view and explains that for objectivists it is possible to move from "public meaning directly to specific states of affairs" Johnson (1987, xxxi). This is exactly the underlying assumption of technical rational professional education: it is thought we can move from academic findings, research arguments or technical models directly to the states of affairs in classrooms. Specific places and circumstances, bodily processes, or acts of imagination and personal feelings and purposes are thought of as irrelevant or else as manipulable in a technical rational manner.

In what follows in this paper I am trying to demonstrate that professional knowledge, like cultural knowledge, is shared and passed on through enactments, particularly through the experience of narrative detail: feelings, moods, imaginative acts, physical arrangements, personal aims and fears, in sum, bits of enacted story.

I look at a particular enactment of one folk model (*knowledge as relating to people*) and see what we might say about that enactment. I restrict myself in this way because I am exploring acts of teaching and learning, not cognitive structures or questions of ontology.[8]

---

[8]A folk model is non-propositional knowledge. The name I gave one such a model *knowledge as relating to people*, is an artifact trying to name an unspecifiable cluster of narrative detail. The folk model itself is not reduceable to any propositions we might use to name it.

Lakoff (1987) and Johnson (1987) talk about "prototypes" in a similar way, when they try to describe what is held in common in dynamic non-propositional clusters of image schemata and metaphors. They also warn us against overestimating the "solidity" of such prototypes that they are not "passive receptacles into which experience is poured", but that they are "flexible in that they can take on any number of specific instantiations in varying contexts"; that they are "fluid patterns that get altered in various contexts", but still "retain a certain relative stability" by becoming "conventionally located" in a network of meaning (p. 29, 30).

There may very well exist prototypes in our teaching culture of the folk models, but it is not the purpose of this paper to circumscribe or establish a prototype. How could one do this in any case? After all, what is the prototype of a "chair"? Can we describe it completely? We all know a chair when we see one, with the exception perhaps of some artistic renderings which may require a second look. Or, children may see a chair-like quality in all kinds of things, which once it was are pointed out let us recognize those things as chairs. How then is the prototype "chair" passed on? By looking at, drawing, producing and buying chairs and by sitting on them.

My effort in this paper is not to prove the sharability of a specific prototype and even less to prove its existence. Nor do I intend to take up the notions folk model as a collection of categorized components which can be named clearly and completely. D'Andrade in his *Folkmodel of the Mind* (1987) did this very well by abstracting detailed characteristics of this particular cultural model from interview material. I do not claim to show what exactly it is, that his held in common by a professional group (Keesing, 1987, calls *"model I" the pool of common sense knowledge and understanding of the community*). Nor do I want to emphasize a cognitive approach by delineating mental principles and recipes held by an individual (Keesing's "model II"). Also work on Schema Theory would be useful here, based on e.g. Mandler 1984. However the assumptions about the nature of "prototypes" allowed me a useful hypothesis about the nature of professional knowledge and let me tentatively link particular actions in a classroom as connected to knowledge which is socially shared.

My starting points on the notion of *folk model* itself were certain aspects described by Johnson (1987) Connelly and Clandinin, (1988) and D'Andrade (1981): Johnson's (1987) emphasizes mind/body connections which ground cultural knowledge in the body and the imagination. In analyzing an interview passage on a man's feelings about rape Johnson pointed out that in order to understand the passage as a meaningful whole, we need to draw on shared embodied metaphors and folk models in our culture. E.g. through folk models about sexuality we take it for granted that sexual activity is a natural consequence of sexual emotions, which in turn are seen as a natural way for men to respond when they see a physically attractive woman. Similarly, details in the fieldnotes I was analyzing did not come together as a meaningful whole, until I began to see them as held together by folk models about knowing and learning in our culture.

Connelly and Clandinin emphasize folk models in professional contexts and link them to personal knowledge. "Children in groups create management difficulties" for them was one such model, which they saw as an example of a "socially embedded professional view" (1988b, 17). They see this model in the culture of teaching as a way a teacher (Judy) "makes professional contact with other teachers" (p. 17). The suggestion that particular actions of a teacher are linked via folk models to knowledge held by a professional group has been a point of departure for me.

I also built on D'Andrade's (1981) suggestion that content-based rather than formal abstraction may be the method of transfer we use in the transmission and learning of cultural models. I thought that narratives might be good vehicles to carry content without depriving it of its links to situation, emotions and moral pressures; narratives also make room for the temporal dimensions of a particular content. For these reasons I gathered together narrative details from the fieldnotes gradually building up a professional version of the folk models "knowledge as relating to people" and "knowledge as hierarchically organized body or corpus". The narrative details included descriptions of physical surroundings , actions, feelings, and ends in view.

One might ask why study folk models in teaching, if we cannot conceptually manipulate them, if they are *in the air*, so to speak, and passed on "automatically" or "by osmosis"? In Carol Burke's case I noticed two contending models at work, and I believe it is important to be aware of such tensions in our practice.[9] Burke's professional career has been shaped by a tension between what she called "teaching rotary" and "having your own kids".[10] It seemed to me that "teaching rotary" happens in schools because we value bodies of specialist knowledge, and for teachers who like "having their own kids", their relationship with the students becomes an important part of the knowledge they impart. In her first years of teaching, in 1965/66, Burke was a homeroom teacher, but subsequently she taught rotary for nineteen years. Yet her subjects, Physical Education and Guidance, emphasized relationship to children. Also, in those years she often chose to team teach, was involved in after-school activities and concerned to see the school evolve into a more close-knit community. All these efforts indicate how important "relating to people" was to her. As she talked with Allen, and later with me, she became more explicit in her description of a tension between two things she considered important: trying to fit a curriculum into what students have previously learned and will need to know in high school, and helping her students learn through good communication with her and with one another.

> What we had at Bay Street School was that everybody has one class and the kids were out for everything ... we had to teach our own science, geography, and history. That is what the people at this level complained about, that the content is so high now, the demand on the curriculum is so high, that you are complaining we are not turning out scholars but ... I don't know if this (rotary system) is any better. For some kids yeah, but a lot of kids no. ...
>
> I think (subject specialization) is great as far as content goes. It doesn't work if a school has a lot of discipline problems, a lot of social, economic problems, because that is why we went off the double rotary system where you had a half a day in homeroom doing language arts and math and half a day rotating from all of the different subjects and we found that discipline problems became greater. ...
>
> There are just so many problems with it. Just keeping tabs on students. ...
>
> Special subjects means seeing everybody but not taking in the nitty-gritty part of the kid you know. So that is one reason we went off rotary. But delivering curriculum is sort of a side problem to that. If there is a balance, I don't know. (Int. May/87).

---

[9]It has not been proven to my knowledge that such an awareness does not in turn affect practice. The study of the entailments of such an awareness might prove interesting although it is not part of my project at this point.

[10]I discussed this tension with Burke by constructing three stories of her teaching and giving them the titles *Teaching Rotary*, *Working with Other Teachers*, and *Liking Each Other as a Basis for Learning*.

In her final year at Bay Street School she seemed to have found that balance to a large degree, "the best of both worlds" as she termed it.

> I had the best of both worlds because I only had one (homeroom) and I had guidance, and I saw my own class for guidance too. And I had them twice a week. I integrated a lot of the health. So I really did have the best of both worlds plus I had a wonderful class. (Int. Dec./89).

Now, in 1989/90, she has changed schools and is teaching a specialist subject, guidance, in the morning to eighteen different groups in each six-day cycle, while counseling children individually in the afternoon and attempting to be a kind of liaison person amongst the staff. She told me that in her current situation she moves from room to room and one of her problems is having to step into another teacher's territory, and into disciplinary situations and classroom relationships she has not created herself. This makes relating to the children more difficult and disciplining children works against the counseling role of a guidance teacher. She is hoping for her own room next year, so that the classes can come to her instead.

In 1986/87, the year the bulk of the field notes were taken, Burke was in a homeroom situation. There, too, the tension between the two models was played out. To illustrate, I begin by giving the end of Burke's story that year as Allen saw it enacted and recorded it in her fieldnotes.

Apparently colleagues had given Burke advice for her "new job", and that advice had implied that kids would be hard to handle during certain periods of the school year when there is no hard and fast curriculum, because examinations are over and grading decisions have been made. This links to the notion of curriculum as a body of knowledge, making it difficult to teach when there is nothing left of a particular chunk of that body to teach at this particular time of year. Burke told part of the story in her own words:

> Well, the May 31st deadline for the change in option sheets. The kids are all aware that the report cards go on to the high school at the beginning of June and that their future is pretty well set. And I wondered what was going to happen for the rest of June and was pleasantly surprised that it didn't make one little bit of difference. So we just continued the June program as we would have anything else. I did at that particular time a couple of things that I would have liked to have done earlier in the year but didn't get a chance to do, and so I put them in there. We had a lot more class meetings and talked a lot more about social and future and guidance type things, informally and without any threat of testing or

that kind of thing. ...

> And it was just good because I knew them so well by that time and it was quite different talking to them than talking to them in September. We looked back over the year. I had them write letters to themselves to be delivered to them in five years with their address on it so that they could see what they were like in grade eight. Well, we did those, and we also wrote some letters to the grade seven's who were coming into my room, about what expectations I had, and what they could expect. So it was looking on, forward looking kinds of things. And then we planned our big trip to the city Tower[11] for dinner and had different fundraising things for June and it was very pleasant. It was not at all what I thought it might be when teachers used to say, "Oh, June -- what you do with them?" It wasn't at all like that.

How this unexpected situation had come about cannot be explained in a few words. It is the story of Burke and her students during that year that needs to be told.

In 1986/87 there was a sense of learning a hierarchical body of knowledge not only in many teacher's views of curriculum and in many of the curriculum guidelines which Burke used, but also in the organization of her school. Hierarchical bodies of knowledge needed to be taught by specialists in each field and learned by groups separated according to their readiness and previous preparation in each area. In grade eight at Burke's school, French, Physical Education, Music and Industrial Arts were rotary subjects taught by specialists in rooms other than the students' homeroom. In 1987/88 Burke and the other teachers voted to put science and math on rotary as well. The homeroom teacher was left to teach language arts and geography.

In the notes of Burke's teaching I saw the alternative professional notion of *curriculum as communicatively structured* at work: It displayed the importance of relationships, democratic responsibilities and a sense of community. I relate this professional notion to the cultural model: *knowledge as relating to people*. Taught versions of this professional notion (or folkmodel) are prevalent today in teacher education programs and curriculum development wherever social skills, cooperative learning and communicative competence (e.g. in second language learning) are emphasized[12].

---

[11]Pseudonym used.

[12]At times the cultural model has "hardened" into technical versions, e.g. in Joyce's work (1986, 1987)

As pointed out earlier in this paper the complete story of this cultural model cannot be told. It may essentially be impossible to ever do so, since folk models consist to a large extent of "obvious facts", of things we take for granted and which have therefore become invisible. I have tried to convey some of these taken-for-granted contents by leaving intact whole sections of the fieldnotes which contain what may seem extraneous details. But it is through these descriptive details that essential components of the model are conveyed. Also certain aspects of the model are implicit in how Burke says things and how she acts in the classroom. There are, as well, physical objects, institutional characteristics and patterns of organization; moreover there are prescriptive elements: the narrative details contain a cultural pool of information which implicitly prescribes the use of its contents and is filled with emotional connotations directing this use (D'Andrade 1981).

My narrative excerpts of the *knowledge as relating to people* model begin in September; then there is a December interlude and the story ends in June. As we hear it unfold, we can attend to physical, moral and emotional components of the model: the physical structures in the classroom are the embodiments of the model in the teaching situation and provide the setting for the story. Professional "how-to's" are present as implicit hints of practice or ways of doing things that are taken for granted. We can also extrapolate moral "ought-to's" or negative sanctions, the good and bad implied in what is done. Again, the model is not intended to be a cognitive one, nor a precise description of the social knowledge of a particular group. It is the model in its narrative form, as enacted by Burke that particular year in that particular classroom. The narrative contains three intermingling voices: that of Carol Burke, in her grade eight classroom; that of Cathy Allen, the participant observer in that classroom in 86/87; and my own voice as I reconstruct both their voices in this paper. Although the content is mostly presented in the words of Allen, it is narratively arranged by me with a few contextual statements.[13]

All of this was done in a collaborative context or as Keesing (1987, p. 372) says, "fashioned

[13]My contextual statements are set in a different font.

together in ongoing interaction", where the teacher was given a chance to veto, support and build on what the researchers were saying. My voice shaped Allen's field notes of classroom events into a more tightly narrative form in order to capture the temporal stretch of the particular model, as well as its moral and contextual qualities. I was also aware of a certain implicit struggle on the part of the teacher to let the "relating to people" model succeed and this awareness of mine influenced the selection of the excerpts.

Getting to like each other in becoming a learning community

In[14] September 1986 Carol Burke was a homeroom teacher after fifteen years of rotary teaching. She had a grade 8 class of immigrant children, children whose command of English varied, children from the lower economic strata of society, some children from families where several members had been in trouble with the law. Carol taught them English, History, Geography, Science and Guidance, using Board and Ministry guidelines, but she also spent much of her time attending to other things.

She had the children decorate the ten bulletin boards available in the rather large room which was their homeroom. She had a rug in the back of the room on which the students sat to have class meetings. Committees were formed, issues were voted on and group ownership and responsibility were stressed. But this did not come easy. The participant researcher Cathy Allen described the early September events:

(By her second day of teaching)[15] Carol had left the classroom basically the way it was when she got it. I believe her intention was to organize it to suit the children and that the students would have a big part to play in how this classroom would be organized. As yet, she has very few things up on the walls ... Early in the day she asked if they had gone to the (exhibition) and other things that they had done over the summer. The students didn't have a lot to say. After the students finished filling out the registration cards she talked to them about classroom management. She said that she wanted to run her class as a democracy and she explained to them what a democracy was. She gave the example of what they might want to do for a Christmas party. She said that some might want to have the party in the room, others might want to have it at her place, and others might want to go to a restaurant. She said that they would vote on this. She asked what the minority would do when they didn't get their choice. She tried to get them to say that they would have to go along with the majority. She finally had to tell them this. She used several other examples to discuss this problem.

She (also) talked to the students about their writing folders. She told them that they could decorate these folders. She talked about the markers at the front of the room that they could use to decorate them. She said the markers belonged not just to her, and not just to them, but to the whole class. ... She talked about the bulletin boards in the rooms. She said that they belonged to the class and that they were responsible for decorating these bulletin boards with their work. She felt that there would be enough bulletin boards for two students per board. (F.N., September 2/86)

Rights and responsibilities seem to be part of the model - in structuring the environment, in making decisions, in ownership of classroom materials and in the sharing of ideas.

---

[14]My additions to Burke's and Allen's voices are set in heavy type.

[15]Minor substitutions inserted by me into Allen's text are in brackets.

(The following week was the first classroom meeting.) At 10:10 she started the classroom meeting. She had the students go sit in a circle on the rug at the back of the room. The first thing Carol said when she had them all seated was she wanted them to talk. She went over what the classroom meeting was. (It was like pulling teeth to get the students to respond.) She said the purpose of the meeting was to plan things. She said she would like each student to take a turn as chairperson. She said this would help them make them aware of the problems that occur at a meeting when people start talking out of turn and talking about different things. But she added that she didn't think they would have to worry about this for a while. The students were very quiet and it was very hard to get them to respond. ... Carol asked them what sort of things they might talk about at a classroom meeting. There was absolute silence. (Eventually they discussed) classroom routines... lates. ... extra help ... walking as a class... seating arrangements... field trips... committees (Classroom Maintenance Committee, Social Committee.) Carol said she would like to be on the Social Committee. The first thing that she would like to do is plan a party for the class at her house; in the next few weeks. She said that they would order pizza or something and that she would probably have it on the weekend because she didn't want them to go home after dark. She said she hoped to have this near the end of September. She said that she would sit on all of the committees and help them out, but she would like students to take charge. She said maybe by the end of the year she wouldn't have to do anything at all. ... She asked if the students had any committees that they could think of. One student mentioned a fund raising committee. Carol said that was an excellent idea and that it required people who were well organized. She told them again that she would help them with all of the committees ... At the end of it, all but 6 of the students were on committees. ...

(A few days later) the vice principal came in then and asked here when she would like to send the students for swimming. She had trouble finding a time because her students are gone so much of the day. She finally decided on day 6 during the 3rd period. He asked her if she wanted the students to go from September to January or from February to June. He told him that she wanted to have the students take a vote. She stood up and asked the students to vote on this. They voted in favour of going from February to June. (F.N., September 8/86)

More and more every day it became evident that Carol valued and modelled friendly, honest interaction, trust and cooperation, as Allen reported:

(While the children were working there was a noise in the hall as Carol and I) talked about former students coming back to (the school). She said she thought it was very nice. She said there were some teachers who didn't like it, and just told these students to go to the office. She said she tried to make time to talk to them, if she didn't have time she would tell them she was very sorry, she hoped they would come back at a later time ... (As a first impression I thought Carol was) very affectionate with the children. She (often) put her arms around them and touch(ed) their shoulders. She smile(d) a lot and seem(ed) very upbeat and fun to be around. ... (In the afternoon at 3 o'clock) she told (the students) to make sure that their desks were cleared and chairs on top of the desks. She said it was important to be in good with two groups of people: caretakers and secretaries. The students then left for the day. (F.N., September 2/86)

She (also) talked (to the students) about their behaviour. ... "I will trust you until you prove me wrong". She gave the example that she would send them to music on their own, but if she started to hear from other teachers that their behaviour was bad she would have to start walking with them. (F.N., September 4/86)

(The next day) She asked for volunteers to help her (in the) afternoon (to wallpaper the bulletin boards) but didn't get any. ... (Later) we talked about the fact that she didn't have any class sets of textbooks. ... She said for her reading program it didn't matter about not having a large number of textbooks because she is planning to put students into groups. She said it usually works out about three reading groups, one high, medium and low. ... At 12:00 she dismissed her students. A former student came into the classroom to visit. Carol asked her about another students who was a friend of this girl, she told that if she

saw her, she would like this other girl to come and visit her. (F.N., September 3/86)

(A few days later) Carol made a note of when their birthdays were. It turned out that two of her students' birthdays were (that day), and another student (was having) her birthday later (that) week. She said that they would have to have a celebration. (F.N., September 8/86)

Carol made definite instructional moves to develop self esteem and mutual respect among her students along with a caring attitude about "kids who are difficult to like".

(By September 9th students were writing journals every morning.) The new topic for their journal was "things that I like about myself that I am good at and that other people like about me". She said this wasn't to be an ego trip but it would be a problem if they couldn't think of anything they liked about themselves. She said "You can't expect other people to like you if you can't think of anything to like about yourself". (F.N., September 9/86)

(A few days ago Carol had mentioned to Allen that) she (thought) they (were) a really good group and even Mike, who (was) a bit of a problem. She said that she could mother him. She would handle him and there wouldn't be any problem. (F.N., September 3/86) ... (Today) there was some discussion with Mike about truant officers ... He said that his parents had been fined $200 and that he had seen two psychiatrists. Psychiatrists had recommended that he go to a special school in the U.S. Carol asked him if his parents had been against it and Mike said they were for it, but he had been against it, that nobody bosses him around. Carol just smiled at that and let it go. (F.N., September 15/86)

Creating a trusting friendly atmosphere also meant awareness and expression of emotions. On September 19th Allen noted a storytelling session:

Although I thought the story was funny and that Carol read very well putting in lots of expression into the words, there was not a lot of laughter or even smiles from the students in the classroom. There were only two students who seemed to find a story funny although occasionally more of the students would laugh. (F.N., September 18/86) ... They discussed how they had felt when they had read the story. One boy said that he didn't like it and Carol asked him why. He said that it was because he wasn't interested in horses which was what the story was about. Carol told him that that was a fine reaction, that if you weren't interested; then that was okay. Rick said that the story had made him feel like he wanted to cry. Carol asked how many in the class had felt sad when they read the story. She asked how many students cried when they saw a sad show. She asked the students how many never cried when they watched a sad movie or read a sad book. None of the students raised their hands. Carol said I am glad that no one said they didn't, particularly the boys. She said that she was glad they were honest enough to admit their emotions. She said that everybody is affected by stories. ... Although the students were supposed to be in charge of asking and answering the questions it never really turned out that way. Carol had to repeat the questions to try to draw the responses from the students. (After class) we talked a bit about Rick's reaction to the story. Carol said she was glad that he had said that, because it gave her the opportunity to discuss showing emotions. Carol said that the other students look up to Rick because he is such a good athlete. I said that I had thought he had been kidding but it was obvious that he wasn't. Carol said she had thought so to when he first mentioned it. I said that showed how he had been socialized to expect boys not to admit feelings and Carol agreed. (F.N., September 19/86) ...

To relate to her students the way she wanted to Carol felt the need to extend the classroom to outside-of-school environments as well as to extend her time with them:

Carol talked (to me) about the students coming in yesterday to set up the room. She said some of them came and helped while some of the others just spent most of the time chatting. She said she had about eight students come and some of them were students that were new to her classroom. She said she had made hot chocolate for the boys and they had just talked about things. Carol said she thought that was quite important even though she didn't get as much done as she had wanted to. She said they were quite funny. Then she talked about three of the boys who were new to her room. She said the reason that they

(also) had come to her was that (their previous teacher) had felt the kids needed "tender loving care". She said that one of the boys came from a family with a criminal background. (F.N., September 23/86)

(In late September) Carol had asked the whole class over to her house, and she told me about it: "Just to start the year off with a little bit of an informal kind of meeting. When we got there we talked ... I ate lunch with a certain group of kids and then I walked home ... with a different group of kids and the kids would tell me ... their personal experiences. It was really early in the year and I think it develops a rapport that would take maybe a bit longer if I hadn't had that kind of day where we did that kind of thing. And when they ... walked into my house and some of the kids said oh, you have got a lovely house Mrs. Burke" and some kids took their shoes off automatically and some kids didn't, and other kids saw that other kids were taking them off, they took them off before they stepped on the carpet and I gave them popcorn for the movie and some kids, they spilled it and took it up right away and put it in the garbage ... It was a good day ... I think probably I will do that every year" (Interview, December 8/86).

By and by Carol felt her efforts led to some success. The students were more talkative, some too much so. And some tension had developed around certain student: Again Carol sought ways to bridge the tensions and create the feeling of a caring community, where each individual was valued.

(By late September) the students were a lot more involved in this discussion than they had been at previous classroom meetings. ... This time more students volunteered for the different committees. ... There was more talking out and Carol told them that they were losing the idea of one person at a time talking. (F.N., September 26/86)

Arthur was a difficult child to handle and not well liked by his classmates.

(One day) Arthur was almost screaming in the class. He seemed to be talking about some movie where they had done kung fu and he was demonstrating all the actions. (F.N., September 29/86) ... (For the reading groups the next day) Carol said she had put Anna (her best student) and Arthur together. Anna had been left out at the group at the front. She said there was a tiny reaction when she made this move, but she had explained to Anna that (she and Arthur) they didn't have to touch, all they had to do was to hand each other their questions and then they could work on them on their own. Anna had said okay then. (F.N., September 30/86)

Carol's emphasis on the affective dimensions of learning seemed to take hold. But she was also aware of the difficulty of maintaining a close relationship with everyone in such a large group.

(In early October I again watched Carol read a story to the students) Her reading was very expressive and she put a lot of emotion and feeling into the words. The students seemed to enjoy the story and there was quite a bit of laughter. (F.N., October 3/86)

(During the following week Carol and a phys ed teacher had a volleyball game with Carol's students. The two teachers won.) Carol joked with the kids about it. She said "I am not going to rub it in", and then she left it like that. Rick said that they hadn't really been trying and Carol said, jokingly, yes, that she understood that if they had really been trying they would have won (F.N., October 9/86).

(By this time the reorganization in the school had taken place and Carol had received a number of additional students. We) talked about the trend to integrate all students into the regular classroom. I said I didn't think this was fair and Carol said, she didn't think it was fair to the regular students either. She said she was concerned about the attention that the regular students would get. In fact she said she was so concerned she was considering putting her son into a private school. ... She said she was concerned because sometimes she goes home at night and she doesn't even know if a student was in her classroom or not. She said she can't remember and she doesn't like that. She said that there were some who demand attention like Arthur, but there were others that were easy to overlook. ... Carol commented that as far as she was concerned the most important

thing was that the teacher liked the students and the students liked the teacher. She said if that is the situation then the students will learn (F.N., October 7/89)

By December there was an easygoing camaraderie along with a more disciplined attitude.

"All of the boys pretty well are very respectful to me and polite and say good evening and good morning and none of them would hurt me in any way at all, like to lash out. Arthur maybe. Last week he told me I was getting old because I had wrinkles under my eyes. I said, 'Oh thanks a lot Arthur! You made my day'. Well, Rick got so mad. 'Well so what', so she is still pretty', or something like that". (Interview, December 8/86)

Carol told me that (early in December) the students had voted to exchange gifts. She said they planned to go to *Mr. Greenjeans* for lunch on the last day of classes before Christmas and then go to a movie afterwards. She said that the students wanted to see *Crocodile Dundee*. She didn't know if it would be in the Cineplex (F.N., December 3/86). We talked about buying Christmas presents, while Carol double checked to make sure that the report cards were in the right envelopes. She mentioned about wanting to go see Crocodile Dundee and Anna asked if there was a bank in the Fairfield Centre.[16] Carol said there was and there was also some discussion about what time the Centre opened. Johnny asked how much money they had in the bank and Carol said they had $300. She said they had started with $250 and had made $50 on their first dance (F.N., December 3/86). ... Carol asked some of the students to go and tidy up the art table. A couple of the students went over. Chris started to sweep up the floor and he asked Carol if she missed Arthur. Carol said, yes, and Johnny told her she must be crazy. ... Jim came and sat at Carol's desk and commented that the students get the hard chairs and the teachers get the soft chairs. He then added that he felt normal today and that he usually feels hungry. Carol came back and pulled him out of her seat and told him that it was time for him to read. The students started to do their reading assignment then. (After a few minutes) the students had settled down and were reading.

Emphasizing flexibilities and authentic interaction Carol reflected on what was important to her in the way she dealt with the students and in the manner she organized her classroom.

(When I asked her) "Does Arthur have any impact on the other students in your program?", (she answered), "Some days he does and some days he doesn't. It depends on the mood of the class, and it depends on the last time that I said to them ignore him. Although I think it is less and less all of the time now". (I asked) "You don't think he slows you down?" (She replied) "Oh once in a while I feel oh, what am I doing and I tell the class that. I sort of apologize? But I mean I will stop for a minute and talk to Arthur and I will say what a waste of time this is, and the class knows, and sometimes I will deal with him, depending on my mood too. And I won't do it all of the time. And sometimes I just get sick of him and they know. And I get out of my desk to walk over and the class knows it that I am up to there. If I am in a good mood, sometimes I just joke with them and carry on with them". (Interview, December 8/86)

Reflecting on the way she had organized her days during the fall term, Carol pointed out how important it was to leave time to attend to individual needs or to simply chat a little.

(Carol said), "I knew teachers used to complain about paper work. Homeroom teachers and attendance taking and collecting the money and all that stuff. And I thought the best time to do that is in the morning so that if those kids have something to do as soon as they come in, that leaves me time to do those kinds of duties and it has worked out perfectly. They come in, they have their writing, they have the journal and they have spelling, and that leaves me time to talk to the kids who want to talk to me and there is always some kid who

[16]Pseudonym.

> wants to tell me what they did last night or what they have to do or what the problem is with this or whatever, or it gives me time to collect things or it gives me time to identify with kids that have to go to the dentist or the doctor or whatever. That kind of thing. So I will do that next year for sure. That is going to work out just perfect for me" (Interview, December 8/86).

Mark Johnson in his book *The Body in the Mind* explained that he wanted to give a kind of "geography of human experience (p. xxxvii)". I see myself attempting something similar through this narrative: I seek to give the "geography" of a particular folk model. This means describing the contours and features of the landscape, while the greater significance of some of them remains hidden to the eye, as the face of a mountain only hints at the rock formations within. In spite of the mass of detail given in this story I ride roughshod over those details - pieces of glistening quartz which might upon closer examination render a wealth of information about the mountain. I thought it more important at this point to describe the lay of the land at the cost of a more in-depth examination of the significance of each detail in relation to the whole narrative or even to the major theme. In doing this I count on the willingness of readers to pull in their own connections and construct signs of significance as they interact with the details of the story. In that way the readers become part of the process by which this particular cultural knowledge is passed on.

I do, however, want to emphasize the narrative qualities of the folk model *knowledge as relating to people* as it is presented here. I see the above narrative as a folk model in action, which puts in evidence a plot - that of building relationships. Carol made specific moves to bring about a feeling of togetherness among the students and between the students and herself. She did this through after-school get-togethers, student/teacher volleyball games, class meetings and patiently dogged prompts for participation. She modeled affectionate and accepting behaviour and authentic interaction rather than stereotyped student-teacher roles. The narrative also brings into view an implicit goal or "ending" - to create a democratic community. Furthermore it describes a setting and an emotional atmosphere, and finally it has a moral. To take these in turn: the setting consists of students sitting in groups in a classroom, which is jointly decorated and jointly cleaned up, and it is a place where materials are shared, meetings are held and voting takes place. There are lots of casual, personal conversations going on, and the classroom is extended to the outside,

through field trips and a party at the teacher's house. Secondly, the mood in the classroom, as it is linked to the notion of *curriculum as communicatively structured*, is created by humour and a certain amount of 'horseplay', but also by mutual respect, honesty, and freely given explanations. Finally, there are certain moral imperatives: *we should try to like those that are hard to like*, *we must not damage self esteem*, and *let's integrate antisocial behaviour*.

There are in this story other moral aspects of a prescriptive nature. They have to do with pedagogic hints. As D'Andrade tells us, folk models are content-based analogues through which components of cultural knowledge are passed on. They contain prescriptive elements which implicitly say: This is the way to go about doing that. Certain pedagogic how-to's are embedded in this story's content as well. They are implicit and embodied in Burke's actions, but they could, at least partially, be abstracted and summarized by instructional advice or professional values such as the following: *be casual; create a vision through possible scenarios; create a setting where positive relationships can be experienced; model them; tell about them and organize your day to make room for fostering these relationships.*

Cultural professional models, because of their narrative quality, are not like formal scientific or other models. I visualize them, if I want to stay within scientific imagery, rather like what Einstein or Riemann in science and mathematics called *fields* - they pulsate and fluctuate and are constantly contoured by particular "boundary conditions", which in our case are people and lived situations or problems to be solved at a particular moment.

It therefore seems generally futile to try to disentangle cultural models from what Keesing calls the "particularities and immediacies of each individual's unique experience in life space" (1987, 382), although it may very well be that what is shared by the group is a prototypical story, that is, one which is relatively bare of specific descriptive details. When we think of the prototype *chair* we tend not to have an image of a specific chair, but call up what Lakoff calls a basic level category in folk classification which, to a certain extent,

corresponds to the genus in scientific categorization (1987, 34). Teachers can tell prototypical, relatively empty "is-when stories", which we can resonate to and, if asked, we would be able to provide specific details for such stories. When the prototypical stories get enacted in the classroom however, the details are all there and those details contour the prototype via a teacher's personal practical knowledge (Connelly and Clandinin 1984, 1986) and the particular teaching context.

I zero in on aspects of Burke's personal practical knowledge as it impacts on the model with regard to the notions of relationship and community. In the fieldnotes I saw evidence that Burke's notion of community is shaped by variations of communal arrangements as they occur in sports in the form of teams, - she taught physical education for many years; in political and community meetings - she is active in school and community organizations; and by the sense of community she experienced in her own family. Community for Burke is not shaped by, for example, the experience of spiritual communities or closely knit rural communities as they may be found in Europe or Asia.

A sense of community contains ideas about relationships among community members. The notion of relationship (for Burke) calls up certain variations which have developed in her personal biography. Narrative accounts (the term is Connelly and Clandinin's, 1990) about these have been written to her (Allen in Connelly & Clandinin, 1989; and Conle 1990 unpublished) and she considers these notions of relationship important in her personal history. They are, for example, an emphasis on giving constant honest explanations, the importance of being flexible, a distaste for arguments and the necessity to get to "like kids that are hard to like". I shall try to illustrate briefly how one of these notions (her distaste for arguments linked to a congenial family-like community) took shape in Burke's life story.

> I just find that if you get along well and you are happy, then you don't have things to worry about and that is my philosophy in my family too, and that is the way I was brought up so I would say, that is where it comes from. I don't know whether I told you before, but in my... my mother died when I was seven so there was my dad and myself and my grandmother who came to live with us. I don't remember a harsh word ever being spoken in our house. Where a normal person would see their father and mother argue once in a while. But my father never argued with my grandmother. I don't remember... I never ever got spanked ever. Apparently my mother would be the one, if I was bad, when I was very little, would give me a smack, but I don't remember ever being hit ever. My dad never laid a hand on me and he... he is totally against that and I think because I was brought up that way, ... I

> hate fighting. Whenever my husband and I argue, it really bothers me, so we don't argue that much. And when my kids argue, it really gets me upset, although they do it just to get me upset (laughter) (F.N., Dec. 8/86).

A distaste for argument is not a universally accepted characteristic of a good relationship, or if it is, it is not emphasized everywhere to the extent it is here, where the folk model as enacted was contoured by Burke's personal practical knowledge.

Now, we might again ask ourselves two questions: one about the extent to which professional models reach out into wider social contexts, and two, why bother gathering such narrative accounts of enacted cultural professional models? I would like to point out that both folk models, *knowledge as hierarchical body* and *knowledge as relating to people*, are indeed widely shared in our culture and have taken on particular significance in contexts of education.

In curriculum literature and curriculum guidelines there is often a predominant pedagogical notion, that what children learn should be structured in a hierarchical way. This notion is to a large extent determined by the assumptions that knowledge has foundations, levels and end points; and that these need to be taught and learned in sequence, or at least arranged in some sort of logical order; that there are accepted traditional ways of doing so, and that professional teachers approach curriculum in this manner. I see in these assumptions a cultural model at work which I call *knowledge as hierarchical body of knowledge*.

The model does not exist just in the area of teaching. It is linked to culturally pervasive versions evident in the academic world as well as in an everyday language. We speak of *levels of achievement*, of teaching the *highest wisdom*, of *building on what we know already*, of not being able to *take it all in*, etc. This ties in with Lakoff and Johnson's work on metaphorical structures. They point to a basic *container* metaphor common in our experiences about knowledge and theories (1980, p. 29,46) that finds expression in our use of language, e.g. when we say *a theory fell apart*, *we need to support an argument* or *the theory was without foundation* (argument and theories as building).

In a more philosophical vein, the model finds expression in academic epistemologies. For example, the German sociologist Jurgen Habermas identified certain cognitive interests underlying all our efforts to know (1971, p. 313).[17] One of these primary interests, the technical one, is concerned with information and aims at control over the environment. Habermas distinguishes this concern from our interest to interpret and understand in order to act among people. The first interest seeks to compile and manipulate a body of knowledge, and method becomes important; whereas the second develops communicative competence and relationship and community become important. Habermas claims that these knowledge constitutive interests take form in our language and in the physical and mental cultures we create.[18] In the field of education there are curricular and instructional assumptions reflecting both of these interests. They are embedded in views of *curriculum as a hierarchically organized body of knowledge* and *curriculum as communicatively structured*. I regarded each of these views as expressions of two cultural models, *knowledge as hierarchical body* and *knowledge as relating to people*. I realize that, once again, the language here is mine, a researcher's language. Teachers and policy makers do not usually use these phrases to express their assumptions, but the latter are dispersed throughout policy guidelines and instructional models.

In academic circles, the cultural model *knowledge as relating to people* lies at the base of hermeneutics which is beginning to be recognized as a way of knowing where the relationship between subject and object is key and where a community of inquirers in conversation with one another is the dominant image. Gadamer (1975, Chpt. 1) traces the notions of communicative structured knowledge back in history through Vico's notion of common sense and back to Roman traditions and western humanist values more generally. They were carried along through the centuries in scholarly training in rhetoric, especially in theology and law.

---

[17]See also Bernstein 1986.

[18]Gadamer (1975) on the other hand introduces the notion of *play* to show a dialectical unity between both kinds of knowing. Our knowledge of a game and (body of knowledge) and the team's interactive creation of it (knowledge as communicatively structured through relationship) are both of equal importance and shape one another.

It is interesting to note that both collaborative learning and hermeneutic inquiry in recent times have risen as critical alternatives to established norms. In everyday life too, the cultural model of *knowledge as relating to people* is often evident only as a critical stance, as, for example, in caricatures of the ivory tower scholar lacking people skills; the "blue stocking" or "unfeminine" well-read woman of Victorian days; and the awkward bespectacled child genius who gets teased by his classmates.

Back to the second question we proposed to discuss: What is gained by exploring folk models when they seem to reflect only good common sense and what is taken for granted by the profession? I believe that by focussing on their narrative quality we open up this taken-for-grantedness and show that for their continued existence cultural models need to be enacted, and continually reaffirmed through being enacted, or else they fade into disuse and die. They are really anything but given.[19] Since situations and personal knowledge contour the story that is enacted, the potential for gradual change is tremendous: each living out of the model changes the plot, the setting, the goals, even if ever so slightly. Once we sense this agency we may feel empowered and responsible, and not at all driven by deterministic structures.

Each enactment then is at the same time a passing on or teaching of the model. We can also envisage that the enactments must have an effect on the professional prototype and, over time, change it as well. This has implications in two areas, one in teacher development and the other in our students' curricula.

Teacher development in this view is not a question of implementation of models. Since our model is neither neat nor definable nor complete, we would not know exactly what to implement. But we can tell it, listen to it and retell it from new perspectives. The telling in

---

[19]Zeichner (1989) points to teachers' knowledge as an evolving body of knowledge: "The reflective practitioner's knowledge is not static and not prescriptive. It is continually evolving and being reconstructed by the practitioner as she reflects on her experiences. The act of reflection, then, serves two important purposes: It provides a framework that enables the practitioner to interpret new situations, choose goals and choose courses of action, and it also provides a method whereby the practitioner can test and improve on earlier ideas and thereby revise the knowledge base in preparation for the next decision. ... (p. 2)."

turn shapes our continued living of it, and the living will call for reconstructions of the narrative previously told. Also, in such stories we can listen for contending models, or recognize ideologies at work that we may philosophically not approve of. (Bowers (1987), for example, has suggested that teachers and educators need to explore ecologically responsive possibilities in teaching and become aware of root metaphors which hide such ecological responsiveness.) There also may be negative sanctions we may wish to open up or remove; or we might want to explore what initially seem counter-intuitive models as I explored an intuitively attractive one.

Those who observe Burke - students or other teachers, - perceive her actions and "see" them linked to their own interests. Teachers or researchers such as Allen and I may see the pedagogy; students may interpret the how-to's more directly as modeled action and attitudes to be imitated, although such conscious interpretations would only be part of what is passed on, a part within the larger cultural transmission which I see happening through the experiencing of the narrative details.

The other important implication then, in looking at narrative models, lies in the fact that the enacted story is what our students see, feel and hear. D'Andrade (1981) assures us that our cultural knowledge is passed on through implicit folk models. I have a story of a student in Burke's classroom that suggests that some of the model described above was indeed learned by him. We should listen for the themes of community and relationship in this story.

Arthur had been a problem for a previous teacher.

> (Arthur's previous teacher) said that Arthur was not one of his success stories. He had had (him) in grade 8 last year. (He) said (Arthur) cursed and swore a lot. (FN, September 23/86).

> ***Earlier in the year Arthur continually attracted the attention of both Carol and the students. As Allen described it:***

> Arthur was talking a lot today. Eventually Carol went over and put her arms around Arthur and checked what he was doing. She told him then that he should be quiet and finish his work (FN September 23/86).

> (Three days later) one of the students mentioned that Arthur was swearing. Carol told him to ignore him, ... that she wanted to finish off the morning in a calm orderly manner and, she said for that reason they were going to do some silent reading for the rest of the period

... Arthur was up talking and Carol went over and put her arm around him and took him over to the side of the room and she then spoke very quietly to him (FN, September 26/86).

(Four days later) Carol told me about what had happened that morning. She said that Rick had told Lucy that Arthur was saying things about her and Lucy had hit Arthur. It turned out that Arthur hadn't actually said any of these things and that Rick had admitted it was his fault and he had apologized. Lucy had also apologized to Arthur (F.N., September 30/86).

When I came into the room (that morning) the students were quietly reading their books. Arthur had brought Carol a note to read. Carol read it and then she asked him if he had sent this note to Mia first. Arthur said that he had. She asked him what he wanted her to do about it. She asked him why he had sent the note to Mia. She said that he had really gotten the reaction he wanted. She asked him whose fault it was and Arthur said that it was his. Carol said, partly. ... Carol showed me the note then and it read: "Mia, you look ugly without your glasses" and he had three boxes, check one "Yes", "No", "Maybe". Mia had responded to this that "you are a fucking asshole and I am going to kick your fucking ass". Carol didn't say anything to Mia but she looked up at the front and the girls were giggling about this. She filed the note away in a folder. (Later that day) Arthur was almost screaming in the class. He seemed to be talking about some movie where they had done kung fu and he was demonstrating all the actions. (F.N., September 29/86)

(For the reading groups the next day) Carol said she had put Anna (her best student) and Arthur together. Anna had been left out at the group at the front. She said there was a tiny reaction when she made this move, but she had explained to Anna that they didn't have to touch, all they had to do was to hand each other their questions and then they could work on them on their own. Anna had said okay then. (F.N., September 30/86)

One time (Carol) went for a walk with Arthur after school because (she) felt something was bothering him (FN, September 30/86). ... (One day in November) she said that she had been out of the classroom this morning and when she came back she found Arthur in the hall. The other students had kicked Arthur out of the class. She found out they had been trying to work and he was shooting rubbers at them (F.N., November 12/86).

(Later that spring Carol described the time) Arthur was with his educational psychotherapist. She said that she had had a talk with the therapist who had wondered how Carol had put up with Arthur for so long. (Arthur had had some severe labels attached to him with regard to an inability to relate to people and to express emotions.) I commented that he had cried when Anna had hit him with the paper and also that we have seen him get angry. Carol said she knew that and had mentioned those incidents to the therapist (FN February 4/87).

Again and again Carol related to Arthur in an honest and friendly manner. Instead of giving up, she kept insisting that he was there to learn, that he needed to listen and relate to people in more appropriate ways. Things began to change in the second term. Arthur initiated some successful interactions and academically too there were some slight improvements.

(One day in February) Arthur brought the paper that Carol had asked him about earlier up to her desk and showed her what it was. On it were three sets of names with wrestlers. Carol read it and asked, "Who are these?". Arthur said they were wrestlers. He asked, "Who do you think would win?" Carol picked first one name and then a second and a third. Each time Arthur said, "That is right, he would win". Arthur congratulated her for knowing about wrestling. Then Carol asked Arthur if he was going to the arcade. Arthur said he was going with Dennis. Carol asked who was paying. Arthur said they each paid for themselves. ...

Later that day (Carol) said that they were going to correct (some) papers now, or at least go over some of the answers. The questions related to an article the students had read from the (local newspaper) about acid rain. Carol asked first "What was the main theme?" Arthur shot up his hand and Carol called on him. He said, "The effects of acid rain are pollution". ... (an interchange of questions and answers follows). Next Carol asked where

did the information originate. She pointed to Steven. He said, "Washington". Carol asked if they could be more specific. Arthur said something quietly and Carol turned to him and said, "Arthur, you have it". He said more loudly, "The pollution sub-committee in the Senate" (FN, February 9/87). ...

(One day) Arthur asked her where Jim was and Carol told him that Jim was right there. Arthur went over to Jim and said something to him which made Carol laugh. She came back and told me that he had said to Jim "you are coming to my house for a birthday party. Bring a birthday present". I asked her if Jim would go and Carol said that he had been going over to Arthur's house but she didn't know if he would bring a present. (FN, March 23/87).

Allen's visit to Carol Burke's classroom ended in April. But there were narrative accounts and interviews after that date. In these Carol continued the story of Arthur and the students. Toward the end of the year the students felt they were a special class and told other teachers that they were. They made comments that Arthur would "have never made it" in an "ordinary" classroom. Several of them in their year-end letters to themselves, which Carol was allowed to read, said in a rather affectionate manner that the class would not have been the same without Arthur. In September on the first day of school, Arthur came back to visit. "Remember me?", he asked. Carol laughed, "How could I ever forget!". Now in 1990 Arthur is still attending high school and he still visits Carol every now and then, showing her his report cards. Arthur's father has come back to thank Carol for helping his son stay in school.

This story about creating relationships and a sense of community shows that there was a link between a folk model and the students' curricula. Change can be perceived at that level, as well as on several others. Specifically, change took place in the students, in the teacher and in the researcher. Arthur and the class as a whole evolved into a more congenial community, while Carol managed to live out and pass on a model other than the one prevailing among a great number of teachers (although she kept the latter alive in other areas of her practice, especially when teaching specialist subjects like science). Also my own teaching changed, as I pointed out earlier, as a result of working with Carol. I have become more conscious of nuances of various relationships created when I am in a teaching role.

Narratives around folk models seem useful as a professional development activity. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) illustrate that, in terms of teacher development, the understanding of our own curriculum as teachers becomes a metaphor for understanding and organizing curricula for students. Collaborative case studies can serve our purposes when we attempt to gain such an understanding.[20] Teachers and researchers may become more aware of the

[20]Sykes (1989) suggests this when he talks about a "relational ethics of care" in his paper on the use of case studies in teacher preparation (p. 17).

filters particular cultural or professional model may impose on their vision. It may increase their sense of choice, of awareness of what they are buying into and of what they are emphasizing or what they are leaving out. Ideally, a multiplicity of folk models in our awareness may contribute to creating what Schwab (1973) called an eclectic stance toward theory and practice. The telling and retelling of folk models as they appear in collaborative case studies may contribute to a teachers' and her students' curricula, if the retelling feeds into various change processes by not consciously divorcing it from life but, by allowing it through elaborate is-when stories - to contain feelings, goals and imaginative renderings of situations. Such activities would counter a technical conception of teacher education. It would no longer be a matter of directly moving from academic concepts to lived situations. Instead morality and imagination come into play through the narratives. Exposing student teachers to good teaching and collaborative narrative activities could become a primary component of their program.

If we look at cultural models in their narrative, enacted forms, we can also open a new door in research. Burke's story is not only a story of a particular teacher in a particular classroom, but it is a professional model reflected in curriculum guidelines and taught models in faculties of education. Therefore, when we understand Burke's story, we have gained insights into aspects of knowledge of teachers as a group. But we have accessed this group knowledge not in a generalized form viewed from the outside. If we did that, Burke's story would be an instantiation or representation of this generalized group knowledge. Instead, Burke, Allen and I have created a collective story with the teacher at the centre, and we have gained an understanding of professional practice from the perspectives of individuals, via individual enactments and collaborative telling of a cultural model. The "is when" quality or narrative quality of folk models can serve teachers and researchers to perceive, talk about and live ever new versions of a model, while at the same time participating in its ongoing reconstruction.

This file: aera90_folkbib_90mar16.ref
[cconle.bibliographies]
Manuscript file: [cconle.aera]
[ieaja_bayst_stor_siss.carols]

References

Bernstein, R. 1986. *Philosophical Profiles*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Bowers, C.A. 1987. *Elements of a Post-Liberal Theory of Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Calderhead, J. 1989. Reflective Teaching and Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education* 5 (1): 43-51.

Carr, D. 1986. *Time, Narrative, and History*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Clandinin, D. J. 1985. Personal Practical Knowledge: A Study of Teachers' Classroom Images. *Curriculum Inquiry* 15 (4): 361 - 385.

Clandinin, D. J. 1988. *Metaphor and folk model as dimensions of teachers' personal practical knowledge*. Working paper, University of Calgary.

Conle, C. 1989. Professional and Personal Knowledge: A Narrative Reconstruction of the Story of a Classroom. In *The Meaning of School Reform: Teachers' Personal and Professional Knowledge in a Changing Policy Environment*, eds. F. Michael Connelly, and D. Jean Clandinin, . Study supported by Transfer Grant #1068.

Connelly, F. M. 1987, June. *Becoming a teacher: A Narrative Approach to the Education of Teachers*. Invited address presented at the Learned Societies Conference, Hamilton, Ontario. .

Connelly, F. M. 1989. Teacher Evaluation: A Critical Review and a Plea for Supervised Reflective Practice. In *Teacher Development*, ed. J. Farrell. Washington, D.C. : World Bank.

Connelly, F. M. and D. J. Clandinin. 1984. Personal Practical Knowledge at Bay Street School: Ritual, Personal Knowledge, and Image. In *Teacher Thinking: A new perspective on persisting problems in education*, eds. R. Hawkes and J. Olson. Lisse: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Connelly, F. M. and D. J. Clandinin. 1986. On Narrative Method, Personal Philosophy and Narrative Unities in the Study of Teaching. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 23 (3): 15-32.

Connelly, F. Michael, and D. Jean Clandinin. 1989. *The Meaning of School Reform: Teachers' Personal and Professional Knowledge in a Changing Policy Environment* (Tech. Rep. No. Volumes I & II). Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. This project was funded by the Ministry of Education under its Block Transfer Grant to OISE (Transfer Grant No. 1068).

Connelly, F. M. and D. J. Clandinin. 1988a. *Teachers as Curriculum Planners: Narratives of Experience*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. Michael, and D. Jean Clandinin. 1988b. Narrative Meaning: Focus on Teacher Education. *Elements* XIX (2): 15-18.

Connelly, F. M. Clandinin, D. J. In press. Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. In *Forms of Curriculum Inquiry: Guidelines for the Conduct of Educational Research*, ed. E. Short, . Albany: Suny Press.

Connelly, F. M., Crocker, R.K., and H. Kass. in press. *Second International Science Study: Phase II* (Tech. Rep. No. Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Grant #411-83-0001-X2). Toronto, St. John's, Newfoundland, and Edmonton: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Memorial University of Newfoundland, and University of Alberta. Final Report, July 1982 - April 1990.

D'Andrade, R. G. 1981. The cultural part of cognition. *Cognitive Science* 5 (3): 179 - 193.

D'Andrade, R. G. 1987. A folk model of the mind. In *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, eds. D. Holland and N. Quinn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elbaz, F. 1981. The Teacher's "Practical Knowledge": Report of a Case Study. *Curriculum Inquiry* 11 (1): 43 -71.

Habermas, J. 1971. *Knowledge and Human Interest*. Boston, Mass. : Beacon Press.

Keesing, Roger M. 1987. Models, "Folk" and "Cultural" Paradigms Regained?. In *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, eds. Dorothy Holland, and Naomi Quinn, 369-393. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, M. 1987. *The Body in the Mind*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Joyce, B., and B. Showers. 1987. *Student Achievement Through Staff Development*. White Plains, N.Y.: Longman Inc.

Joyce, B., and M. Weil. 1986. *Models of Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.

Lakoff, G. 1987. *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and M. Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, G. and Z. Kovecses. 1987. The cognitive model of anger inherent in American English. In *Cultural Models in Language*, eds. D. Holland and N. Quinn. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Mandler, J. 1984. *Stories, Scripts, and Scenes: Aspects of Schema Theory*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Quinn, N. and Dorothy Holland. 1987. Culture and Cognition. In *Cultural Models in Language and Thought*, eds. Dorothy Holland, and Naomi Quinn , 3-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ricoeur, P. 1984. *Time and Narrative*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schon, D. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Schon, D. 1986. The Reflective Practitioner and Practitioners' Narrative Unities. *Canadian Journal of Education* 11 (2): 184-198.

Schwab, J. 1971. The Practical: Arts of the Eclectic. *School Review* 79 : 493-542.

Zeichner, K. 1989. Kenneth Zeichner Reflecting on Reflection. *NCRTE Colloquy* 3 (2): 15-21.